

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/006,166	12/04/2001	Pavel I. Lazarev	A-71153/AJT	2857		
75	590 01/26/2005	EXAMINER				
FLEHR HOH	BACH TEST ALBRIT	HON, SOW FUN				
Suite 3400 Four Embarcad	ero Center		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
San Francisco, CA 94111-4187			1772	1772		

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No	Applicant(s)				
					(b			
Office Action Summary		10/006,1		LAZAREV, PAVEL I.				
	omec Action Cummary	Examine		Art Unit				
	The MAILING DATE of this commun	Sow-Fun		1772				
Period for		icauon appears on m	e cover sneet what the t	orrespondence address -	•			
THE MA - Extensis after SI - If the pe - If NO pe - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI ons of time may be available under the provisions X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commercial for reply specified above is less than thirty (3 eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply by received by the Office later than three months a patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evunication. 0) days, a reply within the staleutory period will apply and wwill, by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be tir utory minimum of thirty (30) day ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communical D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	tion.			
Status								
1)⊠ ह	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 12 November 2	004.					
•	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositio	n of Claims							
4)⊠ C 4a 5)□ C 6)⊠ C 7)□ C	Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> is/are pending in the as Of the above claim(s) is/as Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	re withdrawn from co						
Application	n Papers							
9)[] TI	ne specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
	0)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	pplicant may not request that any object		·					
	teplacement drawing sheet(s) including ne oath or declaration is objected to							
		by the Examiner. N	ote the attached Office	Action of format 10-102.	•			
	der 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)⊠ 1 2 3	cknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation the attached detailed Office action	documents have been documents have been of the priority documental Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Applicat ents have been receive le 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s	s)							
	of References Cited (PTO-892)	NTO 048)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) Informa	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date			Patent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/12/04 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Withdrawn Rejections

2. The 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) rejections have been withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment dated 11/12/04.

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 6-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent parent claim 1 recites that the layer of liquid crystal material has the parameters which provide the interference maximum or minimum of transmission or reflection at

Art Unit: 1772

the exit of the front panel. Therefore it is unclear how the other functional layers can also be providing the interference maximum or transmission at the exit of the front panel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belyaev et al. (EP 0961138 A1) in view of Khan et al. (US 5,764,001).

Regarding claim 1, Belyaev has a liquid crystal information display (abstract) comprising a layer of liquid crystal material between panels of functional layers (first and second plates where at least electrodes and polarizer are positioned) ([0214], page 24, lines 58 and page 25, line 1). Belyaev teaches that the polarizer can have parameters which provide at least one interference maximum or minimum of transmission or reflection for at least one linearly polarized component of incident beam of light (5) ([0270] lines 33-43) at at least one wavelength reflected or transmitted at the output of the polarizer. Belyaev teaches that the means for changing the polarization of the polarized light can also be a layer of liquid crystal ([0285], lines 40-50). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided the layer of liquid crystal material with the parameters which provide at least one interference maximum or minimum of transmission or reflection for at least one linearly polarized component of incident beam of light, in place of the polarizer, as taught by Belyaev.

Belyaev teaches that the interference maximum or minimum results in the respective mutual intensification or attenuation of the linearly polarized component of incident beam of light reflected or transmitted ([0270] lines 33-43). This mutual intensification or attenuation is

Application/Control Number: 10/006,166

Art Unit: 1772

desirable at the exit of the front panel on the viewer side, in order to obtain the maximum intensification or attenuation of the respective light beams comprising the display image, as observed by the viewer. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have conducted routine optimization of the parameters of the liquid crystal layer of Belyaev, in order to obtain at least one interference maximum or minimum of transmission or reflection for at least one linearly polarized component of incident beam of light at at least one wavelength reflected or transmitted at the exit of the front panel, for the respective mutual intensification and/or attenuation of the respective light beams comprising the display image, as observed by the viewer.

Regarding claims 2-3, Belyaev teaches that the anisotropic liquid crystal layers (polarizing coatings) are applied on the planarization layers (surface profile smoothening insulation films), and since they also align (orient) the nematic liquid crystal of layer 52 (column 38, lines 45-60), they simultaneously function as alignment layers and color filters (due to their anisotropically absorbing dye nature) (column 8, lines 35-60).

Regarding claims 4-5, Belyaev teaches that when a voltage bias is applied on the electrode layer, the liquid crystal state can be converted to provide no change to the polarization plane direction ([0333], lines 9-11). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided the interference maximum or minimum of transmission for the reflected or transmitted light at the exit of the front panel, with or without voltage bias on the electrode layer.

Regarding claims 6-17, Belyaev teaches that the optical thickness of the functional layer provides the interference maximum or minimum ([0056], lines 1-40). This mutual

Application/Control Number: 10/006,166

Art Unit: 1772

intensification or attenuation is desirable at the exit of the front panel on the viewer side, in order to obtain the maximum intensification or attenuation of the respective light beams comprising the display image, as observed by the viewer. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have conducted routine optimization of the optical thickness of the functional layer of Belyaev, in order to obtain at least one interference maximum or minimum of transmission or reflection for at least one linearly polarized component of incident beam of light at at least one wavelength reflected or transmitted at the exit of the front panel, for the respective mutual intensification and/or attenuation of the respective light beams comprising the display image, as observed by the viewer (claims 6-9).

Furthermore, Belyaev teaches that the necessary number of layers does not exceed 10 ([0057], lines 40-45). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have conducted routine optimization of the number and parameters of all the layers in the display of Belyaev, in order to obtain the interference maximum or minimum of transmission at the exit of the front panel, for the mutual intensification and/or attenuation of the respective light beams comprising the display image, as observed by the viewer (claims 10-17).

Regarding claims 18-33, Belyaev teaches that the polarizer is positioned on one of the panels (plates) ([0214], page 24, lines 58 and page 25, line 1). Hence the polarizer is an internal one.

Regarding claims 34-50, Belyaev teaches that the anisotropic layer (page 8, lines 39-59) comprises an oriented (page 11, line 40) layer of organic dye where {Chromogene} (SO₃)_n is the dye K of Applicant which contains the SO₃ ionogenic groups which provide its solubility in

Application/Control Number: 10/006,166 Page 6

Art Unit: 1772

polar solvents in order to form a stable lyotropic liquid-crystal phase, $(M)_n$ is the anti-ion M of Applicant and n is the number of anti-ions in the dye molecule (page 9, lines 45-50). A layer with a thickness of 0.1-0.2 mcm (page 9, lines 40-50) constitutes a film.

Regarding claim 51, due to the liquid crystal nature of the organic dye (column 9, lines 50-55), the film formed by the oriented liquid crystalline dye is crystalline.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1772

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sow-Fun Hon whose telephone number (571)272-1492. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached on (571)272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sow-Fun Hon

Sow-Fun Hon
0 1/21/0 J

1/24/05